



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

US
11472
2

MS 11472.2



Harvard College Library

FROM

By Exchange of Duplicates



Mr. ... *C. M. ...*
cover
6511472.2
O

REFUTATION AND EXPOSURE

OF

CLERICAL MISREPRESENTATION,

MADE AGAINST

THE LATE THOMAS P. BEACH.

By Benjamin Hickman.

"The true reformer, must throw by
All thought of ease or resting till he die:
Although, through life, he may not hear
The voice of friend, nor see one loving eye
To cheer him on his way of duty high,
And warn him when his foes are lurking near:
Yet those who now
Scowl with mad hate, before his tomb shall bow."

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers."

GEORGETOWN:
CHARLES NASON, PRINTER, WATCHTOWER OFFICE.
1848.

US 11472.2

* 1862, Sept. 26.

By exchange of duplicates.

[FOR THE WATCHTOWER.]

THE LATE THOMAS P. BEACH.

MR. EDITOR:—Your readers will doubtless recollect an article that appeared in the Watchtower of the 2d of April, 1847, respecting the late Thomas P. Beach, headed “A Desirable Change,” which, if true, would amount to a renunciation of the principles which he professed and advocated while in this vicinity a few years since. Wishing to learn the facts in the case, I wrote to Mrs. Beach shortly after the publication of the article above alluded to—copying the article entire from the Watchtower—requesting an early reply, but received no notice of its reception until this week, the reasons why, the reader will understand on perusing the following extracts from a letter, bearing date of February 9th, which I have just received from the Rev. Joseph P. Fessenden—an Orthodox preacher—of South Bridgton, Me.

As Mr. Beach was well known in this vicinity, you would doubtless gratify many by giving the following an insertion in your paper.

BENJAMIN JACKMAN.

GEORGETOWN, Feb. 17.

“I was requested by Mrs. Beach to answer your kind letter of inquiry, sent to her in Ohio, which is dated April 9th, 1847. In June last, I visited Mrs. B., in company with my wife, who is the sister of the late Thomas P. Beach. Your letter was not directed to the right county, in consequence of which Mrs. B. did not receive it till long after its date; and when it came to hand, she was too feeble in health to answer it. Indeed, she was so unwell from the time of her husband's decease, till last Autumn, that she was unable to correspond with any of her friends. Since my return

from Ohio, my time has been so much occupied with parish and other duties, that I forgot my promise to write you, till reminded of it the present week in a letter from her.

* * * * *

You further inquire respecting Mr. Beach's last illness and death, and ask, "did he renounce his views of the church and ministry, and the various other reforms which he so firmly believed and so fearlessly advocated while in New England, as has been reported?" You then quote from the "Watchtower" and the "Ohio Observer" extracts which would seem to indicate that his feelings and views on the above named subjects, were very much changed before he left the world.

Mr. Beach's sickness was billious intermittent fever, which seized him violently and terminated his life in a little more than a week from the first attack. His brother, who is a physician, and at whose house he died, informed me, that, in his rational intervals, he expressed great love for, and perfect confidence in his Saviour, and *died peacefully trusting in Him*. There is no reason whatever to believe that "his views of the church and the ministry, and the various other reforms" in which he engaged so heartily and boldly, were *essentially* changed. This will be manifest, I think, to you and others, from an extract from a letter written to me *only two months* before his death. The letter was written on rising from the perusal of a sermon I sent him, preached by me before the "Union Conference," with which I am connected, and published by request of friends. He says in this letter—"I received and read yesterday your sermon, from which I arose with a disposition and determination to write you immediately, but was obliged to postpone it till to-day. I have just returned from a Sunday School celebration. Among the speakers was a Texan priest, right from the land of slaves, so, of course, out of deference to his pious prejudices against the *great work* of this century, the abolition of slavery, not a word was said in reference to it, no allusion to the day, (it was the first of August) or the pioneer work of W. I. emancipation. All this is additional illustration of the truths, brought to the unwilling ear of the Union Conference Clergy, in your sermon. I know not how long you have held the views therein set forth—one thing is true—for preaching those very truths, I was warred upon by those same priests, and my shadow ex-communicated by them, for I had left them some time before. I am glad on the whole and after mature reflection, that you have not left them. Were I now among them I should remain. I looked upon *it then* as a duty, but was influenced in my views of duty by others, who were impatient to hear the cry of division in the church.

I now think that a reformer's place is in the church, until he is

ex-communicated for preaching boldly the truth, and then he should move steadily along in his work, in which he will find want of sympathizing friends. This matter of their warlike character, their stained and blood and brains besmeared Juggernaut, will shake mightily the church of this land—and the Moral Reform question, when its pure principles are applied to the preaching and practice of the clergy, will shake them from the back of humanity, as a deadly vampyre. I have every reason to believe that you have well considered your ground in that discourse; for it must necessarily drive you from the church or rend the church in pieces.”

“You will readily perceive from the above extract, that the only change in the views of Mr. Beach, consisted in the belief that he mistook his duty in voluntarily leaving the church and ministry.—He thought he ought to have remained in his place till he was *driven* from it by boldly preaching the truth to the delinquent members of the church and its *time serving and stony hearted clergy*.”

[The above was published in the Georgetown “Watchtower,” of February 25th, to which were added the following editorial remarks:—]

We publish the above, because the friends of Mr. Beach, if they choose to do it, have a right to be heard in correcting any erroneous impression that may have been made respecting a change in his character before death, however desirable such a change would have been. And if it is their choice to encourage such as had his sympathy and aid when living, by assuring them that he was unchanged until the last, it will be ours to tell them something more.

When the article in the Watchtower, to which reference is made above, was published, we had nothing to do with the paper. Up to the present time, we have never written a line respecting Mr. Beach, nor ever expected to. How far Mr. Jackman went in sustaining him, we know not; and can judge of his present opinions and feelings only from this correspondence.

That our readers may know just what had been said that is now contradicted, we will copy from the Watchtower of April 2d, 1847. It is as follows:—

A DESIRABLE CHANGE.—The Ohio Observer has a notice of the death of Thomas P. Beach, whose name is familiar to most of our readers. He was at one time a Congregational minister in Wolfboro’, N. H., but having been led astray by the false philanthropy

of the Garrison school, he fell into some of the worst errors of his associates, and lost his standing in the ministry and the church. It appears that he was mercifully brought to repentance before being called to give up his account for the deeds done in the body.—He died in Sharon, Ohio. The writer in the Observer says :—

For nearly a year past, however, there has been obvious on the part of Mr. B. a marked and steady return back to the state of mind, in reference to the Christian religion and its institutions, in which he was when he began his labors at Wolfsboro', and it is a matter of relief very precious to his Christian friends, that he was not taken away until he unequivocally condemned that part of his course which resulted in his separation from the Church and the ministry, and had testified that he anew found peace in believing in Jesus.

Mr. Beach expressed his intention, had his life been continued, of seeking re-admission to the Christian Church, and his desire of resuming the office of a Christian minister, if Providence opened the door."

This representation the brother-in-law of Mr. Beach considers "*essentially*," if not entirely erroneous, and brings evidence to prove it so. Let us see how that is.

His sickness, it seems, was very violent and very short ; and he had only lucid intervals while it lasted. We do not regard the Observer, or his correspondent, whichever it was, as necessarily writing from any knowledge had of him during that short period. With no evidence to the contrary, he may have gone upon the presumption that his opinions and feelings then, were the same as they had been *understood* to be for some time previous. It is somewhat remarkable that in this latest account, coming from his nearest relatives, all that is said of him in his last hours is comprised in a single sentence. But then, if so much only were publicly said, the Observer might have hastily concluded that he had not mistaken the character of the man. *Hastily*, for we think he might well have looked for some expressions of repentance and regret in such a case, in any lucid moment, if there had really been the change supposed.

The direct contradiction in these two statements respects what Mr. Beach professed to be some time previous to his death. Mr. Fessenden has brought evidence to prove that the Observer was in error. It is direct and explicit, proving all he desired.

Did, then, the Observer make up the story, with no seemingly

good grounds for supposing it was true? That is not probable, and in this very evidence by which Mr. Fessenden convicts him of error, we see what, with our knowledge of Mr. Beach, convinces us that he may have had what seemed amply sufficient to warrant the statements made. "I am glad on the whole that you have not left them," writes Mr. B. to Mr. F., and then goes on to tell into his confiding ear the reason why, and discover what was in his heart, and his wishes still. "I regret my course in having left the church," and much more, may he not have said to others and concealed his real meaning and motive as he spoke.

The truth is, Mr. Beach, in his best estate, was *insincere* and given to deceiving. We are not saying what others have told us, or what we *guess*, but what we *KNOW*. We never saw the man after he became a *par excellence* reformer, but knew something of him years before—when his demure look and "holy tone" were quite effective, and he was thought to be a saint indeed. Without intending to say that he was thoroughly hypocritical, we *do* say, what we *DO KNOW*, that even then he would not hesitate to feign what he knew was false, to gain an end entirely selfish. We early made that discovery, not by seeking it, nor in any matter in which we had even the slightest interest. Wishing for a little influence, without seeming to ask it, in helping him to gain a position he was seeking, and presuming on our ignorance, he represented certain things as facts, in his own arrangements, which we knew were falsehoods. Such conduct, not seen in a single instance only, but repeated, filled us with disgust. And remembering that his father was shot dead by a custom house officer while attempting to run cattle, duty free, across the Canada line, during our last war with Great Britain, we thought he might perhaps have inherited a character for insincerity, which found in that circumstance his only apology for some portion of his conduct.

Knowing what we did of the man, it was no surprise to us, some years after, to hear, at a distance, that he had disgraced himself and was leading others on to infamy. He was selfish, and, withal, desirous of standing very much in the public eye. And so,—that is our belief—like some other such, he mounted on a noble cause, making it a pack horse to carry him up to a summit from which he

might be seen from near and far. But, as often happens in such cases, he fell to a place of misery and shame. Let others take warning by his example.

We have not said these things from any wish to stir the ashes of the dead. We do not judge the man as he was at death. But as he has been brought upon the stage to play a part once more, we have thought it well to tell how easy it was for him to do it when alive.

And just see, from his latest confessions, how he arrived at his convictions of *duty*, and to what *ends* he was, by a sense of that, impelled. "I looked upon it *then* as a duty, *but was influenced in my views of duty by others*, who were impatient to hear the cry of DIVISION IN THE CHURCH." He thinks he should have remained in the church, as that would have been, to be "*driven from the church, or rend the church in pieces.*" What a beautiful spirit have we here.

SOUTH BRIDGTON, March 6, 1848.

DEAR SIR:—I cannot say, in truth, that I am surprised at the scurrilous abuse of the Editor of the Watchtower, in his article, which follows an extract, published in his paper, from my letter to you. Such have been the manifestations of reckless depravity in many of the men, claiming to be ministers of Christ, that I have long since ceased to expect anything like *christian candor*, or even *truthfulness*, in any statements which they may make, respecting those who espouse the anti-slavery and other kindred unpopular reforms, and labor faithfully to promote them. I speak of the ministry as a *body*. There are some honorable exceptions; but these, as far as my knowledge extends, are few.

It seems to me impossible, that Mr. Gannett's malignity can injure the memory of Mr. Beach in the minds of *any* persons of common intelligence and honesty, in *any community whatever*. His tirade carries, *on the very face of it*, such *clear and incontestable marks* of utter meanness and want of principle, that it will only serve to render the remembrance of Mr. Beach still more dear to his former friends, and must, I think, greatly shake the prejudices, which, even his enemies, who have a particle of integrity or fairness about them, may have imbibed against him.

1st. Reflecting people will perceive, that Mr. Gannett was not called upon, in his official capacity, to animadvert upon the character of Mr. Beach. He had no connexion with the Watchtower, when the article referring to Mr. B., and headed a "desirable change," was inserted in that paper. He, therefore, was not responsible for that article; and why should he be so ready to volunteer his services in traducing the reputation of a *dead man*? His remarks were wholly gratuitous, and could have been induced by nothing but the promptings of a malicious and slanderous heart.

2d. They will see that there is no material discrepancy, and certainly *no contradiction* between what is said in my letter to you, and the statements concerning Mr. B., made in the paragraph extracted into the Watchtower, from the Ohio Observer. It is doubtless true, that Mr. Beach did, for a time, embrace opinions "*in reference to the christian religion and its institutions*," which he afterwards renounced. And the writer in the Observer correctly says, that there was in him, *in this respect*, "a marked and steady return back to the state of mind, in which he was when he began his labors in Wolfsboro'."

That he mistook his duty in leaving in the manner he did the church and the ministry, he perhaps openly acknowledged, and "unequivocally condemned that part of his course."

After going to the West, Mr. Beach informed me of his intention of again seeking a union with some religious community, friendly to liberty and the great questions of Moral Reform, and expressed the belief, that, in such a community, if he were connected with it, he would be able to exert a greater and more extensive influence for the good of his fellow men. In the same letter he mentioned a visit to Oberlin, and spoke of many things in that community, which he approved, and some other things which he disliked. Doubtless he expressed the same intention to friends in Ohio, and to this the writer in the Observer alludes in the closing sentence of the extracted paragraph. The *false impression* respecting the change which took place in Mr. Beach's views previous to his death, is *given by the remarks of the Watchtower*, introducing to its readers the extract from the Observer, relating to him. The *writer* of these remarks unquestionably intended to give the readers of the Watch-

tower to understand, that previous to leaving the world, Mr. Beach renounced his views of the body of the church and ministry and all the other questions of moral reform, which he embraced and openly and boldly advocated in New England. Now nothing could be more unjust to Mr. B. than such an impression. And I am quite sure, the writer in the *Observer* did not intend to give any such impression. Where, then, is the foundation for Mr. Gannett's assertion, "Mr. Fessenden has brought evidence to prove that the *Observer* was in error"? It has no foundation. *The assertion is untrue.* I proved that what was implied in the remarks of the writer in the *Watchtower*, and what was reported respecting Mr. Beach's renunciation of his "views of the church and ministry and the various other reforms which he so firmly believed and so fearlessly advocated while in New England," was false. Does the *Observer* say that he did renounce his views in regard to any of these questions? It says no such thing.

3d. *What is Mr. Gannett's testimony against a man who is in his grave and cannot speak for himself? And how is this testimony supported?* He uses the following language—"The truth is, Mr. Beach, in his best estate, was insincere and given to deceiving. We are not saying what others have told us, or what we *guess*, but what we *know*. We *do* say, what WE DO KNOW, that he would not hesitate to feign what he knew was false, to gain an end entirely selfish. Wishing for a little influence, without seeming to ask it, in helping him to gain a position he was seeking, and presuming on our ignorance, he represented certain things as facts, in his own arrangements, which we knew were falsehoods. Such conduct, not seen in a single instance only, but repeated, filled us with disgust." Very candid, and charitable and christian-like and *bold withal*, for a minister, is this Mr. Gannett; *thus to bear witness* against a man *sleeping in the grave!!* I know not how it may appear to others, but to me it seems an ebullition, more cowardly and fiendish, could not have emanated from the sooty heart of an inmate of the bottomless pit. Mr. Gannett was a professed minister of the Gospel, when, according to his account of the matter, Mr. Beach attempted, for the accomplishment of a selfish purpose, to deceive him, and uttered, in his presence, what Mr. G. knew to be falsehoods. Did Mr.

G. rebuke Mr. B. *at the time*, and *publish him* to the world, as a selfish deceiver and a liar? He does not intimate that he did. *No*; he waits till Mr. B. is dead, and *then, brave man when he cannot be confronted by his victim*, brings these railing and venomous accusations against him!! Nothing is adduced by Mr. G. in support or corroboration of *his own mere* assertions. Mr. Beach is arraigned, tried and condemned, when "mouldering in the silent dust," by the Rev. Allen Gannett, who acts, in the case, as prosecutor, witness, jury, and judge. Let me remind Mr. G. there is another tribunal, at which the accused will have the privilege of meeting his accuser face to face, and, it is possible, the matter may wear a somewhat different aspect there, from what it does under his sole management.

4th. The *climax* of Mr. Gannett's baseness will now be briefly noticed. Not satisfied with defaming the character of the deceased son, he endeavors to brand with infamy the memory of his murdered father.

He says—"And remembering that his father was shot dead by a custom house officer while attempting to run cattle, duty free, across the Canada line, during our last war with Great Britain, we thought he might perhaps have inherited a character for insincerity, which found in that circumstance his only apology for some portion of his conduct." In this statement, made, as he roundly asserts, *from his own remembrance*, one, and *only one truth* is told by Mr. Gannett, and that one truth is this; the father of Thomas P. Beach "was shot dead during our last war with Great Britain." Before writing the above, it might have been well for Mr. G. to have inquired of some *school-boy*, whether the inhabitants of belligerent nations are permitted, *by paying duties*, to carry on with each other, as in time of peace, commercial intercourse in *cattle* or other goods?

So far from its being, as Mr. G. *in the abundance of his charity*, supposes, a fact, that Mr. B. "inherited a character for insincerity from his father," let me inform him, his father was a man of intelligence and moral worth and was greatly respected and beloved by all the virtuous part of the community where he resided. Many now living of undoubted veracity, would be glad, if called upon, to

give their united testimony to the truth of what I here say of him. *He was not killed while running cattle across Canada line, nor by a custom house officer; but he was shot through the heart while pursuing his lawful business with his own lawful property, in the town of Canaan, Vermont, within a mile of his own house, by an ignorant, infatuated man, who was instigated to the commission of the dreadful deed, by his political opponents.*

Mr. Gannett seems to be quite horror-stricken at what Mr. Beach said to me of the consequences that would result from a faithful exhibition of the truth and application of the great principles of moral reform, to the church. I wonder whether he is not more shocked, and does not with more emphasis, exclaim, "What a beautiful spirit have we here," as he reads the words of our Saviour, "I came not to send peace on the earth, but a sword." I am come to send fire on the earth and what will I if it be already kindled?" Let me say in conclusion, if Mr. Gannet be a fair specimen of the body of the clergy and if the professors of religion, who sustain and love the spirit and instructions of such ministers, be a fair sample of the body of the church, then I rejoice that Mr. Beach went to his grave; entertaining the views which he did, of both.

Respectfully, JOSEPH P. FESSENDEN.

BENJAMIN JACKMAN.

The preceding communication from Mr. Fessenden was not received till after the following was sent to the Editor of the "Watchtower" for publication.

The manner in which *that* article was disposed of by the *magnanimous* Editor will be understood on reading his strictures upon it, which appeared in the Watchtower of March 10th and will be found at the close of the succeeding article. The Editor complains of his language being "perverted" and of being offered "repeated insults" &c., while almost with the same breath he is guilty of the same offence which he attributes to another. After suppressing a communication sent him for publication, he publishes *his own* version of the affair, interspersed with garbled extracts from the article, and thus, makes out his case apparently to his *own* satisfaction; such a course, is free discussion indeed,—but, if the reader will pardon a homely comparison—it is too much like the handle of a jug, *it is all on one side.*

What a magnanimous and christian spirit "have we here."
Verily consistency is a jewel!

THOMAS P. BEACH.

Mr. Editor.

It was not my intention when I prepared a former communication for your paper respecting the above named individual, to trouble you or your readers with anything further on the subject; but since reading the editorial comments which are appended to that article, I have felt it incumbent on me to so far trespass on your indulgence as to request you to publish the following, from the pen of the Rev. J. P. Fessenden, written a few weeks after the death of Mr. Beach; they are so opportune that I trust you will comply with the request—coming, as the testimony does, from one who “knows” whereof he affirms.

It may be deemed superfluous for me to add anything to what Mr. F. has written, it is such an explicit and unequivocal vindication.

I had no personal acquaintance with Mr. B. until *after* he became, what the Editor is pleased to term, “a *par excellence* reformer” consequently I shall leave it for those, whose opportunity for knowing his true character previous to that period, cannot for a moment be doubted, to repel the slanderous insinuations, and opprobrious epithets, with which his memory has been assailed.

There are one or two ideas in the Editorial to which I have alluded, upon which I wish to bestow a passing notice. I was somewhat surprised at the invidious allusion to the “demure look and holy tone” of Mr. B. one would suppose judging from observation—that they were generally considered as a part of the “essentials” in the qualifications of a successful modern clergyman. Was it considered the reverse, and, consequently, a just cause for bitter taunt, *while he was one of the* “brotherhood?”

Not content with sullyng the reputation of *one* man, his father's ashes must be exhumed that he may be “brought upon the stage to play a part once more.” Now, on what system of ethics the son is made any way responsible for the misdemeanors of the father, I am at a loss to determine, unless, the writer of the article under consideration is a *Jew*; it is, I believe, in accordance with the Jewish ritual that the iniquities of the father's should be visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generations.” Not so with the “new and better covenant.”

Is there any “insincerity” in all this? Does it look like being “given to deceiving?” Or like a wish to *stir the ashes of the dead*? I put the questions to those who think. True the reference to his father, is made, under the specious pretence of “an apology” for Mr. B's course, but when the reader takes into consideration, the general tenor of the article, he will doubtless find it to be an

exercise of charity dictated neither by reason or common sense to believe that to be the motive of the writer.

BENJAMIN JACKMAN.

GEORGETOWN, March 2d. 1848.

THOMAS P. BEACH.

'The evil that men do, lives after them ;
The good is oft interred with their bones.'

Seldom, or never, perhaps, is justice done to a reformer, while living ; and when he dies, his cotemporaries are reluctant to award to him the esteem which is actually his due. An attempt is not often made to call in question the correctness of the principles he embraced and inculcated ; nor is it denied that he labored assiduously, with great self denial and apparent disinterestedness, to render society better and happier, and to reclaim men from sin and suffering, by inducing them to become sincere lovers of God and one another. But his *motives* are suspected and impugned, the *measures* which he pursued are condemned as unwise and improper, and an error or two of judgment into which he may chance to have fallen, is magnified and constantly presented in a distorted form, to the public mind, and is made to counterbalance, and even throw into utter forgetfulness, the good which he was instrumental of accomplishing. Such is the treatment, which, hitherto, in his life-time, the reformer has always received, at the hands of a censorious and ungrateful world. And the generation who survive him, and for whose welfare he has toiled, with weariness and painfulness, never properly estimate his character. His faults they remember, and often speak of ; but his virtues they forget, and bury the good he has done, with him in the grave.

I have been led into this train of thought, by reflecting upon the life and death of my friend and brother, whose name stands at the head of this article. He died suddenly of bilious chill fever, at Sharon, Ohio, on the 30th of Sept. I am prompted by a sense of duty to say a few words respecting him, now he has gone to another world. I have known him intimately and familiarly, from childhood. For several years my house was his home—and it was under my roof, he received his first abiding serious impressions, and was emancipated, as he hoped, from the bondage of sin, and brought into the light and liberty of a redeemed son of God. In his natural disposition, he was ardent, generous, affectionate and kind. In his moral deportment, he was always unexceptionable. In obtaining his education, he encountered and overcame difficulties, that to ordinary persons would have been insurmountable. But by invincible perseverance and untiring effort, he succeeded in graduating at

Bowdoin College, with a good reputation as a scholar, and the confidence and esteem of his instructors and associates, in the class of 1833. He acquired knowledge easily, and rapidly, was eminently successful as a teacher of youth, and was uniformly beloved and respected by his pupils.

As a preacher of the gospel, he always commanded attention, and, while engaged in the ministry, devoted himself to its duties, with exemplary diligence and fidelity. In every great moral and religious enterprise, he engaged with characteristic ardor of feeling and determination of purpose. He was the warm friend of the temperance reformation, and labored, indefatigably, for its extension and promotion. He was a thorough going peace man, and viewed all wars and fightings as utterly repugnant to the teachings and spirit of the gospel of Jesus Christ. In the situation of the wronged and bleeding slaves of our country, he took a lively interest, early espoused their cause and fearlessly opened his mouth in their behalf. The apostolic injunction, Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; without hesitation he obeyed; but in obeying it, he was compelled to encounter coldness and bitter opposition from those of whom he had a right to expect sympathy and assistance.

It was with heart-sickening sorrow he found, that, not only in his immediate vicinity, but in the country generally, the ministry, and the church under their tuition, had as a body, no bowels of compassion for the enslaved; their feelings were on the side of the oppressor, and against the oppressed. Whilst they affected great piety and concern at the deplorable condition of heathen abroad, they were utterly indifferent and callous to the much more deplorable condition of millions of heathen at home; made such, by the current religion and laws of a professedly christian and republican nation.

Inconsistency so glaring, hypocrisy so barefaced, Mr. Beach could not fail of perceiving, or refrain from rebuking, openly, with merited severity.

He was thus brought into collision with professedly religious teachers and religious men, who, failing to silence or overcome him by truth and argument, resorted at length to the very common indeed, yet mean, disgraceful and wicked expedients of calumny and misrepresentation, for the accomplishment of their object. Conscious of his own integrity, and of being on the side of humanity and of God, it is no marvel that a man of his temperament should be deeply grieved and incensed at the treatment he received; and induced, perhaps precipitately and rashly, to renounce the ministry, and abandon the church, and even to imbibe opinions on some subjects, and do some things, which both sound reason and revelation condemn.

If it be inquired by any of his former friends, why, for nearly three years past, nothing has been heard, in this region, from Mr. Beach, on the subject of abolition, I would inform them, that, having sacrificed all the little property he possessed, in the cause of the slave, he found himself in poverty, surrounded by unrelenting enemies, constantly endeavoring to do him all the injury in their power, with a wife and three helpless children, dependent on him for support.

Thus situated, it was impossible for him to obtain for his family the means of a comfortable subsistence, and he sought with them, these means among strangers, in a distant city of the West. There he found friends and patrons, and was successfully engaged as a teacher of the young, when fatal disease fastened upon him, and he died, respected and deeply lamented by those whose acquaintance he had thus recently formed. I am assured that he maintained the integrity of the great principles of reform, which he had long professed and boldly defended, to the end of life; and left the world calmly and happily, in confident expectation of a blessed immortality, through the merits of the Saviour whom he loved, and whose example he endeavored to follow.

J. P. FESSENDEN.

SOUTH BRIDGTON, Dec. 15th, 1846.

MR. BEACH—AGAIN.

"We have received another communication from Mr. Jackman, accompanied by an eulogy on Mr. Beech, by Mr. Fessenden, said to have been written soon after his death, with a request for publication. Mr. Jackman's communication is written in the genuine style and spirit of the so-called modern "Reformers." We have never heard a syllable about him,—not, to our recollection, so much as the mention of his name; but his communications are making us acquainted with his character. He says he never knew anything of Mr. B. till after he became a "Reformer." Yet, in commenting on what we had said of our knowledge of him years before that time, he talks about repelling "the slanderous insinuations, and opprobrious epithets, with which his memory has been assailed." He misrepresents and perverts some things we had said, as also some portion of the Scripture: but afterwards, when on another tack, shows that he had no need to be told what our meaning was. That is the seal and stamp of the "genuine article." And in fact these self-styled "Reformers" are never long in discovering to what tribe they belong. Such is the outline and complexion of their moral form and features, it is as manifest as a cloud on a back-ground of bright and beautiful sky.

Now we like to be thought good-natured; but really should not choose to be regarded as having the quality in such excess that we would gratify another by publishing a communication in which we were offered deliberate and repeated insult. That would be no virtue. So Mr. Jackman, while he may have good reason to think us very good-natured and accommodating, will please understand that he has somewhat overrated the measure of our mercy this time.

As for Mr. Fessenden's eulogy on Mr. Beech, written more than a year ago, which he asked to publish, because "it is such an explicit and unequivocal vindication," we may say that, however "explicit and unequivocal" in its statements, it could not be any refutation of the facts we spoke of, as of our own knowledge, and never publicly alluded to before. And further, we should have no objection in the world to publishing any statement of reasonable length from him respecting any amiable qualities he had ever observed in his brother, if in all other respects unexceptionable. In the extract from his letter to Mr. Jackman which we published, there were some expressions that were not so; but as it did not come direct from him to us, and we knew not if he was aware it would be published, we let them pass unnoticed. The piece before us has much more of the same kind; and if it were published by request in our paper, we should feel constrained to poison a lance for the opinions that must reach through to their author.—That we are unwilling to do while ignorant of any wish or knowledge of his beforehand respecting the publication."

**This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.**

**A fine of five cents a day is incurred
by retaining it beyond the specified
time.**

Please return promptly.

US 11472.2

Refutation and exposure of clerical

Widener Library

005740961



3 2044 086 338 076